

REMARKS

The examiner rejects claims 16-20 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Rinehart (6359331). As amended independent claim 16 has the feature of a high frequency capacitor and a bulk capacitor. This feature is not disclosed or anticipated by Rinehart, and as such independent claim 16 and its dependent claims 17-20 are not anticipated under 35 USC 102(b).

The examiner rejects claims 1-8, and 10-23 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinehart in view of Huber (6147882). The examiner argues that Rinehart discloses all the elements of the present application with the exception of the bulk capacitor. The examiner then argues that since Huber utilizes a bulk capacitor it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ the teaching of Huber in Rinehart. Rinehart discloses utilizing one or two high frequency capacitors in a high power switching module such as would be used in a hybrid vehicle. The switching module of Rinehart does not, however, utilize any bulk capacitors. Huber discloses the use of bulk capacitors in an input current shaping device for a low power single phase application such as a computer power supply. Since neither Rinehart nor Huber discloses a system using both a high frequency capacitor and a bulk capacitor, and Rinehart and Huber are used in significantly different applications requiring significantly different qualities there is no teaching to combine the two. Additionally the Rinehart disclosure only indicates that a capacitor would be needed for decoupling purposes. The high frequency capacitors disclosed in Rinehart meet this need, and bulk capacitors would not. Because of this Rinehart provides no indication or suggestion that inclusion of another different type of capacitor (such as a bulk capacitor) would be beneficial. As such, claims 1-8 and 10-20 are allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over Rinehart in view of Huber

The examiner rejects claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a) over Rinehart in view of Huber in further view of Aker (6803746). The examiner has not explained how Aker meets the requirement of both an approximately 500 μ F capacitor and an approximately 800 μ F capacitor from claim 9. Aker discloses utilizing a 750 μ F capacitor, which the examiner then argues meets the limitations of both the listed capacitors of claim 9. Using identical capacitors for both applications in the current device would defeat claim 1 as it would remove the distinction between a “high frequency capacitor” and a “bulk capacitor.” Because of this, application of the Akers reference could not possibly result in the capacitor configuration of Claim 9. Additionally the Applicant

notes that since the combination of Rinehart in view of Huber would not occur (as argued previously) neither could the combination of Rinehart in view of Huber and in further view of Akers. As such claim 9 is allowable.

If any fees or extensions of time are ever required, please charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds.

Respectfully Submitted,
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.

/John E. Carlson/

John E. Carlson
Registration No. 37,794
400 West Maple, Suite 350
Birmingham, Michigan 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: December 11, 2007